

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are in the case.

The applicants have studied the Office Action dated December 30, 2004 and have made the changes believed appropriate to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

Numeral 68a, on page 9, paragraph 23, line 16 is not shown in the figures.

Numeral 68b, on page 9, paragraph 23, line 23 is not shown in the figures.

The Examiner's objections have been addressed in the amendments to the specification offered *supra*. More specifically, the reference numerals 68a, 68b have been corrected in the specification to 67a, 67b, respectively. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for correction of the drawings should be withdrawn. A complete set of formal drawings is attached.

The abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because of the following:

On page 8, paragraph 21, numerals 40a, 40b are referred to as slots, which were previously referred to as "slidable mounts."

The Examiner's objections have been addressed in the amendments to the specification offered *supra*. More specifically, the reference numerals 40a, 40b, 40c have been corrected in the specification to 39a, 39b, 39c, respectively.

In addition, the specification has been corrected as kindly suggested by the Examiner:

On page 9, paragraph 21, line 2, "61a (Fig. 2)" has been deleted and replaced by "61a (Fig. 4)." It is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-17 and Claims 18, 30-32, 34-35 have been provisionally rejected under 35 USC 101 as claiming the same inventions as those of claims 1-17 and 12-14, 16-18 of copending Application No. 10/661,027. The assignee has opted to abandon application 10/661,027 in favor of the subject case. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these provisional double-patenting rejections are moot.

Claims 1-5, 19, 20-29, 36 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Trueira. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24, for example, is directed to an “ion implanter electrode for use in an ion implanter adapted to generate an ion beam, comprising: an electrically conductive electrode support frame which defines an aperture; and  
an electrically conductive insert member adapted to be inserted into said ion implanter support frame, said insert member comprising an electrode body portion defining an aperture and adapted to be inserted into said support frame aperture, said insert member further comprising first and second alignment surfaces of which said first alignment surface is groove-shaped; wherein said support frame further comprises a first alignment pin positioned to engage said ion implanter insert member groove-shaped first alignment surface and a second alignment pin position to engage said ion implanter insert member second alignment surface to align said insert member aperture in an aligned position relative to said ion implanter support frame wherein said electrode body portion is positioned to receive said ion beam passing through said aperture, said insert member further comprising a plurality of retention flanges adapted to engage said ion implanter support frame and to retain said electrode body portion in said aligned position within said ion implanter support frame and electrically coupled to said support frame.”

It is the Examiner's position that the Trueira reference describes an ion implanter support frame 90 and/or support frame 80. However, the frame 90 is not part of an electrode for an ion implanter as required by claim 24. Instead, the Trueira reference describes the structure 90 as an “alignment fixture removably mounted on the source housing 44 ...” Trueira reference, col. 6, lines 37 *et seq.* The Trueira reference makes clear that the alignment fixture 90 is “removed from the ion beam source housing 44” (col. 9, lines 24 *et seq.*) and therefore is not a part of the ion implanter electrode.

The Examiner has cited pins 122 of the Trueira reference. However, the Trueira reference indicates that the pins 122 are part of the alignment fixture 90 (see FIG. 7a). Hence, it is clear that the pins 122 are not part of an ion implanter electrode. Similarly, the slots 105 cited by the Examiner are part of the alignment fixture 90 (see FIG. 7b). Hence, it is clear that the slots 105 are not part of an ion implanter electrode.

The support tube 80 cited by the Examiner does appear to be a part of the ion implanter of the Trueira reference. However, the pins 122 and slots 105 cited by the Examiner are part of the removable

